

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

SHARODD HARGROVE,

Plaintiff,

v.

ANGEL SANTIAGO, *et al.*,

Defendant.

Civ. No. 14-4754 (WJM)

OPINION AND ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on *pro se* Plaintiff Sharodd Hargrove's motion, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b)(6), for reconsideration of this Court's denial of his second motion for appointment of *pro bono* counsel under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). The Court assumes the parties' familiarity with the underlying facts of the case and prior decisions of the Court. For the reasons stated below, the Court will **DENY** the motion.

Plaintiff's dissatisfaction with the Court's decision is insufficient to warrant relief under Rule 60(b). *See Max's Seafood Café by Lou-Ann, Inc. v. Quinteros*, 176 F.3d 669, 677 (3d Cir. 1999) (A motion for reconsideration may be granted only if: (1) there has been an intervening change in the controlling law; (2) evidence not available when the Court issued the subject order has become available; or (3) it is necessary to correct a clear error of law or fact to prevent manifest injustice); *Boretsky v. Governor of New Jersey*, 433 F. App'x 73, 78 (3d Cir. 2011) (A party's mere disagreement with a decision of the district court is insufficient to warrant reconsideration). Rather, Plaintiff's newest filing confirms that he is more than capable of presenting his own case at this stage of the litigation (the first factor under *Tabron v. Grace*, 6 F.3d 147, 153 (3d Cir. 1993)).

Thus, for the above reasons and for good cause shown;

IT IS on this 19th day of April 2016, hereby,

ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration is **DENIED**.

/s/ William J. Martini

WILLIAM J. MARTINI, U.S.D.J.